

1-21-2004

## CWU Faculty Senate Minutes - 01/21/2004

Janet Shields

Follow this and additional works at: <http://digitalcommons.cwu.edu/fsminutes>

---

### Recommended Citation

Shields, Janet, "CWU Faculty Senate Minutes - 01/21/2004" (2004). *Faculty Senate Minutes*. 514.  
<http://digitalcommons.cwu.edu/fsminutes/514>

This Meeting Minutes is brought to you for free and open access by the CWU Faculty Senate Archive at ScholarWorks@CWU. It has been accepted for inclusion in Faculty Senate Minutes by an authorized administrator of ScholarWorks@CWU. For more information, please contact [pingfu@cwu.edu](mailto:pingfu@cwu.edu).

**CENTRAL WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY**

**FACULTY SENATE**

**Approved REGULAR MEETING MINUTES: January 21, 2004**

**<http://www.cwu.edu/~fsenate>**

Presiding Officer: Daniel CannCasciato  
Recording Secretary: Janet Shields

**ROLL CALL:**

**Senators:** All senators or their alternates were present except: Peter Barbee, Lori Braunstein, Patrick Bryan, Robert Carbaugh, Toni Culjak, Jim Eubanks, Cania Lee, Tim Melbourne, Mark Michael, Nancy Wessel

**Visitors:** Marla Wyatt and Carolyn Wells

**CHANGES TO AND APPROVAL OF AGENDA** – Motion to approve was made and seconded. Motion approved.

**MOTION NO. 04-01 (Approved): APPROVAL OF MINUTES of December 3, 2003**

**COMMUNICATIONS – None**

**REPORTS/ACTION ITEMS**

***Executive Committee***

**Motion No. 04-02 (Approved):** "Ratification of 2003-04 Faculty Senate Standing Committee members as attached in Exhibit A."

**Motion No. 04-03(Appeared):** "That the Faculty Senate Executive Committee work with the Provost's office to implement the general recommendations of the "Summary of Findings of the Ad Hoc Faculty Development/Mentoring Envisioning Group, April 1, 2003".

***Curriculum Committee***

**Motion No. 04-04(Appeared):** "Recommendation to accept program change of Bachelor of Music: Music Business to Bachelor of Arts: Music Business as outlined in Exhibit B."

**Motion No. 04-05 (Approved):** "Recommendation to accept new program of Middle Level Math/Science Minor as outlined in Exhibit B."

**Motion No. 04-06(Appeared):** "Recommendation to accept change to CWU Policy Manual – Section 5.10.5.1.5 as presented in Exhibit B."

**REPORTS/DISCUSSION ITEMS**

**Provost Soltz (3:30):** Faculty Salary Base Report - This report was provided in a handout and is also on the senate website  
<http://www.cwu.edu/~fsenate/FacSalPoolNov03.pdf>. Provost Soltz went over some of the highlights of the report.

SAB process was given \$250,00 this year. The University will add benefit costs to that amount. Overall 2/3 of the money went to fund SAB Plan A. Letters were sent out last week and faculty should have received these on Friday or Monday. Letters were sent whether you received an adjustment or not. 93 faculty did receive an adjustment as

part of Plan A. \$1483 was average adjustment. Plan B deadline has been adjusted to January 27<sup>th</sup>.

**Wendy Williams:** Evaluation of Instruction Committee – Handout was provided. Professor Williams provided an overview of where the committee is headed with respect to putting together a system to include students, peers, administrators and faculty themselves. The goal is to put together a progressive evaluation of instruction that shows faculty development. Faculty that might be struggling with teaching can get credit for seeking out faculty development to help them with their progress. Professor Williams indicated the committee is not done with their work and is requesting an additional two years to complete what they have started.

**CHAIR:** Financial aid was distributed last week and the local banks were running low on cash, due to the run on cashing checks. Summer Session Advisory committee has mostly finished their work on the budget portion. Previously Faculty Development money to the Senate was capped at 20% of revenues with \$100,000 being the minimum. At the request of the Executive Committee a proposal has been tentatively agreed on that would change the Faculty Development money to 10% of excess revenue or \$100,00 whichever is greater. The \$100,00 ceiling would become the floor. This would help fit with the call for development, scholarship, proactive role of committee. This proposal goes to budget advisory committee on February 3. Web development policy is being developed. If the web policy is of interest to you or your department, please e-mail Daniel. Daniel asked if Senate needs to be in discussion on how this is developed or if we want to make comments once it comes out in draft form?

**CHAIR ELECT:** None

**PRESIDENT:** President McIntyre reported that the new member of Central's Board of Trustees is Sid Morrisison. He has very strong experience, in the state legislature and in congress as well as a respected businessman from this part of the state. The President thanked all those who attended or watched Mary Robison lecture. This program will be rebroadcast one time and is scheduled for Thursday at 7:00 pm on Channel 15. A tape of this lecture will be archived in the library. Central's message is being received very well in Olympia this year with, thanks to all of the members of the team. Our voice is being heard. Right now, at the beginning of the supplemental session -- which is supposed to be a shorter session -- there are some interesting discussions going on. Might be a better session than 2 years ago, as the economy is a little better.

**PROVOST:** See Faculty Base Salary report above.

**SENATE CONCERNS:** Cap on summer school – urges Executive Committee to find a way to make it clear. No specific college should be abused.

**STUDENT REPORT:** - None

**SENATE COMMITTEES:**

**Ad-Hoc Salary Administration Board -** Plan A has been finalized and letters went out. Plan B deadline is Tuesday, Jan 27<sup>th</sup> and \$83,000 is available for Plan

B. More detail on the distribution of Plan A will be provided as soon as information is available to committee.

**Academic Affairs Committee:** - Committee has new co-chairs. As discussion continues on web policies, this committee would be interested in being involved.

**Budget Committee:** Bill Bender indicated that the committee has a series of meetings with the Provost this winter & spring. New team members on the committee are up to speed and hope to have more influence in the budget process.

**Code Committee:** No report

**Curriculum Committee:** Marla Wyatt is now the chair of this committee. Catalog change deadlines are on web and please use new forms.

**Development and Appropriations:** No report

**General Education:** No report

**Personnel Committee:** No report

**Public Affairs Comm/Council of Faculty Reps/Faculty Legislative Representative:** Professor Huckabay will provide a report each week send and will be available on the senate website. This session is supposed to be easier and a shorter session. The state CFR decided they needed a vision for Higher Ed in Washington and faculty roles. One of the main goals of CFR is to let legislators know what Higher Education is in Washington and what faculty roles are. Also to let them know faculty are a group. CFR acknowledges the differences between the 4-year institutions, but speak for faculty as a whole. Performance contract bill is before the legislature this session. In the Governor's version of the bill he provided for protection of union contracts. The CFR wants language added to protect faculty code documents as well. The bill sets two institutions to be test cases for the next 6 years. One to be a research institution, University of Washington, and one to be a comprehensive institution, Western Washington University. The HEC Board will be the principal negotiating body for these agreements. CFR is talking to legislature about what faculty role should be as part of the COMPACT process. Another bill would create a common course catalog for all community colleges and 4-year institutions. Main purpose is articulations between the community colleges & 4-year institutions. Looks like this bill will be dropped. Talk about wanting to create a new 4-year institution, Cascadia State University, as a way to deal with big enrollments that are coming. League of Education voters are proposing a 1% sales tax to help fund education. Doesn't look like it will come out of committee.

## **OLD BUSINESS**

**Motion No. 03-75 (Approved):** "Extend the Ad Hoc Evaluation of Instruction Committee for another two years, to end March 31, 2006."  
(Cf. Senate Minutes, Jan. 30 and March 6, 2002.) Motion No. 03-75a was made to bring motion 03-75 to the table and seconded. Questioned called and approved.



## **NEW BUSINESS**

**ADJOURNMENT** A motion was made to adjourn and seconded. It passed by a majority at 4:55 pm.

## Exhibit A

<b>Curriculum Committee</b>	
Mary Wise	Library
<b>Code Committee</b>	
Don Nixon to replace Patsy Callaghan	Business Administration, COB
<b>Development &amp; Appropriations Committee</b>	
Patsy Callaghan to replace John Creech	English, CAH
<b>Faculty Grievance Committee</b>	
Connie Roberts	CEPS

## Exhibit B

**Program Change:** Bachelor of Music: Music Business change to  
Bachelor of Arts: Music Business

**Rationale:** The Bachelor of Music designation of the present program necessarily entails applied performance expectations that have not proven appropriate to the goals and talents of most music business students. These performance expectations also result in too many credits in the degree (138-149). The change of degrees from B.M. to B.A. allows the music core requirements and performance expectations to be reduced. Specifically: 1) MUS 342 (3) is deleted from the music major core – it is in the BA Music degree program; 2) Applied performance requirements are reduced in two ways – a. from 18 to 12 credits, and b. the level attainment reduced from the MUS 364 level to the MUS 264 level. Changes have also been made in the business course requirements.

### **Program:**

#### **Music Required Courses:**

Music core (minus MUS 342)	36	
MUS 154A Class Piano	3	
MUS 164/264 Applied Lessons	12 *	
Major Ensembles	22	Total 73

\* Must include at least 4 credits at the MUS 264 level.

#### **Major/Business Required Courses:**

MUS 490 Cooperative Education	2 – 12	
MUS or Bus upper division electives	10 – 0 **	Total 12

\*\* Credits for MUS 490 and Music and/or Business Electives must total at least 12, with a minimum of 2 credits of MUS 490.

#### **Business Required Courses:**

ACCT 301 or ACCT 251	5	
MUS 482 Business Music	3	
BUS 241 Legal Environment of Business	5	
COM 208 Intro to Media Writing	4	
OMIS 221 Intro to Business Statistics	5	
MGT 380 Organizational Mgmt	5	
HRM 381 Mgmt of Human Resources OR		
MGT 481 Organizational Behavior	5	
MKT 360 Principles of Marketing	5	Total 37

Total credits required 122

**New Program:** Middle Level Math/Science Minor

### **Rationale:**

The Middle Level Math/Science Minor has been created to meet the Middle Level Math/Science state endorsement for teachers. Students who are Elementary Education, Biology Teaching, Chemistry Teaching, Earth Science Teaching, Mathematics Teaching, and endorsed Physics majors will be eligible to enroll in this minor. The program will be taught out of Science Education, Mathematics, Teacher Education Programs, and Curriculum and Supervision.

**Funding:** Funding for this minor program was provided by the Higher Education Coordinating Board as a High Demand Program.

**Program:**

<b>Science</b>	Three introductory science courses with lab (1 life science, 1 earth science/astronomy, and 1 physical science required.)	15
<b>Math</b>	MATH 130.1 Finite Mathematics I	5
	MATH 164.1 Foundations of Arithmetic I	5
	MATH 250 Intuitive Geometry for Elem. Teachers	4
	EdEL 468 Problem-solving Techniques	3
<b>Other</b>	SCED 323/Math 323 Teaching Exp in Math & Sci.	3
	EDEL 477 Middle School Students & Their Env.	4
	EDCS 482 Instr & Assess. For the Middle Level	3

<b>In Addition</b>	Elementary Education Majors must take: EDCS 424 Reading in the Content Fields	
	Secondary Science Majors must take: EDEL 323 Elementary Math Methods	
	Secondary Math Majors must take: SCED 322 Science in the Elementary Schools	3

**Total Credits required** **50**

**Policy Change: CWU Policy Manual – Section 5**

- 5-10.5.1.5 Hold on Course Numbers.** An eight-year moratorium exists on course numbers. ~~If a course number has not been used for eight years, the number may be used again.~~ The eight-year moratorium will begin as follows:
- At the time a course is deleted.
  - At the time it is put on reserve by a department.
  - Retroactively, when a course was last taught before automatically being put on the reserve list. (i.e. A course number that has not been taught for three years and placed on reserve for an additional three years then deleted, can be used again in two years after the deletion.)  
See Section 5-10.6.16.2.

**Roll Call 2003-04****Faculty Senate Meeting: January 21, 2004****SENATORS**

BARBEE	Peter
BRADLEY	Joseph
BRAUNSTEIN	Lori
BRAUNSTEIN	Michael
BRYAN	Patrick
BUERGEL	Nancy
BURNHAM	Timothy
CALAHAN	Scott
CANNCASCIATO	Daniel
CANT	Gregory
CAPLES	Minerva
CARBAUGH	Bob
CHAPMAN	Leland
COLEMAN	Beatrice
CULJAK	Toni
DEVIETTI	Terry
DIPPMANN	Jeffrey
EASTMAN	Grant
EUBANKS	Jim
HARPER	Jim
HARPER	Lila
HUBBARD	Brenda
HUTTON	Lisa
HUCKABAY	Jim
KURTZ	Martha
LEE	Cania
LI	Charles
LUBINSKI	Patrick
LUPTON	Robert
MELBOURNE	Tim
MICHAEL	Mark
NELSON	Joshua
NETHERY	Vincent
NIXON	Don
PRICE	Joe
REHKOPF	Carrie
SCHAEFER	Todd
SNEDEKER	Jeff
SUN	Key
WESSEL	Nancy
WELLOCK	Thomas
WILLIAMS	Henry

**Quorum: 23****43 Senators****ALTERNATES**

Student	
HOLTFRETER	Robert
KLEMIN	Wayne
PALMQUIST	Bruce
ERNEST	Kristina
WYATT	Marla
VACANT	
CALHOUN	Ken
JORGENSEN	Jan
FAIRBURN	Wayne
BUTTERFIELD	Carol
GHOSH	Koushik
DONAHOE	Susan
OGDEN	Michael
ABDALLA	Laila
FALLSHORE	Marte
LI	Chenyang
GELLENBECK	Ed
STEIN	Stephanie
GLASBY	Stephen
OLSON	Debbie
ROBINSON	Scott
FOLKESTAD	William
ALWIN	John
DIAZ	Anthony
Student	
DRAKE	George
CUTSINGER	Loran
PERKINS	Rob
LEE	Jeff
Student	
BRANSDORFER	Rodney
D'ACQUISTO	Leo
BAGAMERY	Bruce
BENDER	William
BROOKS	Joe
WIRTH	Rex
SINGH	Vijay
REASONS	Charles
PICHARDO	Nelson
EASLEY	Roxanne
PLOURDE	Lee

**Date: January 21, 2004**

## VISITOR SIGN-IN SHEET

Maria Wyatt  
 MICHAEL R. OGDEN  
 Carolyn Wells

**Please sign (print) your name if you are not a faculty senator.**



**CENTRAL WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY**  
**FACULTY SENATE**

**REGULAR MEETING**  
**Wednesday, Jan. 21, 2004, 3:10 p.m.**  
**BARGE 412**  
**AGENDA**

- I. ROLL CALL**
- II. CHANGES TO AND APPROVAL OF AGENDA**
- III. MOTION NO. 04-01: APPROVAL OF MINUTES of December 3, 2003**
- IV. COMMUNICATIONS –**
- V. REPORTS/ACTION ITEMS (25 Minutes)**

***Executive Committee***

**Motion No. 04-02:** “Ratification of 2003-04 Faculty Senate Standing Committee members as attached in Exhibit A.”

**Motion No. 04-03:** “That the Faculty Senate Executive Committee work with the Provost’s office to implement the general recommendations of the “Summary of Findings of the Ad Hoc Faculty Development/Mentoring Envisioning Group, April 1, 2003”.

***Curriculum Committee***

**Motion No. 04-04:** “Recommendation to accept program change of Bachelor of Music: Music Business to Bachelor of Arts: Music Business as outlined in Exhibit B.”

**Motion No. 04-05:** “Recommendation to accept new program of Middle Level Math/Science Minor as outlined in Exhibit B.”

**Motion No. 04-06:** “Recommendation to accept change to CWU Policy Manual – Section 5.10.5.1.5 as presented in Exhibit B.”

**VI. REPORTS/DISCUSSION ITEMS**

**Provost Soltz (3:30):** Faculty Salary Base Report *(15 minutes)*

**Wendy Williams:** Evaluation of Instruction Committee *(15 minutes)*

**CHAIR:** *(10 Minutes)*

**CHAIR ELECT:** *(10 Minutes)*

**PRESIDENT:** *(10 Minutes)*

**PROVOST:** *(10 Minutes)*

**SENATE CONCERNS:** *(5 Minutes)*

**STUDENT REPORT:** *(5 Minutes)*



**SENATE COMMITTEES: (10 Minutes)**

**Ad-Hoc Salary Administration Board**

**Academic Affairs Committee:**

**Budget Committee:**

**Code Committee:**

**Curriculum Committee:**

**Development and Appropriations:**

**General Education:**

**Personnel Committee:**

**Public Affairs Comm/Council of Faculty Reps/Faculty Legislative Representative:**

**VII. OLD BUSINESS**

**Motion No. 03-75 (Tabled 12/3/03):** "Extend the Ad Hoc Evaluation of Instruction Committee for another two years, to end March 31, 2006."  
(Cf. Senate Minutes, Jan. 30 and March 6, 2002.)

**VIII. NEW BUSINESS**

**IX. ADJOURNMENT**

**\*\*\*NEXT REGULAR SENATE MEETING: February 11, 2004\*\*\***  
**BARGE 412**

## Exhibit A

<b>Curriculum Committee</b>	
Mary Wise	Library
<b>Code Committee</b>	
Don Nixon to replace Patsy Callaghan	Business Administration, COB
<b>Development &amp; Appropriations Committee</b>	
Patsy Callaghan to replace John Creech	English, CAH
<b>Faculty Grievance Committee</b>	
Connie Roberts	CEPS



## Exhibit B

Program Change: Bachelor of Music: Music Business change to  
Bachelor of Arts: Music Business

**Rationale:** The Bachelor of Music designation of the present program necessarily entails applied performance expectations that have not proven appropriate to the goals and talents of most music business students. These performance expectations also result in too many credits in the degree (138-149). The change of degrees from B.M. to B.A. allows the music core requirements and performance expectations to be reduced. Specifically: 1) MUS 342 (3) is deleted from the music major core – it is in the BA Music degree program; 2) Applied performance requirements are reduced in two ways – a. from 18 to 12 credits, and b. the level attainment reduced from the MUS 364 level to the MUS 264 level. Changes have also been made in the business course requirements.

**Program:**

**Music Required Courses:**

Music core (minus MUS 342)	36	
MUS 154A Class Piano	3	
MUS 164/264 Applied Lessons	12 *	
Major Ensembles	22	Total 73

\* Must include at least 4 credits at the MUS 264 level.

**Major/Business Required Courses:**

MUS 490 Cooperative Education	2 – 12	
MUS or Bus upper division electives	10 – 0 **	Total 12

\*\* Credits for MUS 490 and Music and/or Business Electives must total at least 12, with a minimum of 2 credits of MUS 490.

**Business Required Courses:**

ACCT 301 or ACCT 251	5	
MUS 482 Business Music	3	
BUS 241 Legal Environment of Business	5	
COM 208 Intro to Media Writing	4	
OMIS 221 Intro to Business Statistics	5	
MGT 380 Organizational Mgmt	5	
HRM 381 Mgmt of Human Resources OR		
MGT 481 Organizational Behavior	5	
MKT 360 Principles of Marketing	5	Total 37

Total credits required 122

New Program: Middle Level Math/Science Minor

**Rationale:**

The Middle Level Math/Science Minor has been created to meet the Middle Level Math/Science state endorsement for teachers. Students who are Elementary Education, Biology Teaching, Chemistry Teaching, Earth Science Teaching, Mathematics Teaching, and endorsed Physics majors will be eligible to enroll in this minor. The program will be taught out of Science Education, Mathematics, Teacher Education Programs, and Curriculum and Supervision.

**Funding:** Funding for this minor program was provided by the Higher Education Coordinating Board as a High Demand Program.

**Program:**

<b>Science</b>	Three introductory science courses with lab (1 life science, 1 earth science/astronomy, and 1 physical science required.)	15
<b>Math</b>	MATH 130.1 Finite Mathematics I	5
	MATH 164.1 Foundations of Arithmetic I	5
	MATH 250 Intuitive Geometry for Elem. Teachers	4
	EdEL 468 Problem-solving Techniques	3
<b>Other</b>	SCED 323/Math 323 Teaching Exp in Math & Sci.	3
	EDEL 477 Middle School Students & Their Env.	4
	EDCS 482 Instr & Assess. For the Middle Level	3

**In Addition** Elementary Education Majors must take:  
EDCS 424 Reading in the Content Fields

Secondary Science Majors must take:  
EDEL 323 Elementary Math Methods

Secondary Math Majors must take:  
SCED 322 Science in the Elementary Schools 3

---

<b>Total Credits required</b>	<b>50</b>
-------------------------------	-----------

**Policy Change:** CWU Policy Manual – Section 5

- 5-10.5.1.5 Hold on Course Numbers.** An eight-year moratorium exists on course numbers. ~~If a course number has not been used for eight years, the number may be used again.~~ The eight-year moratorium will begin as follows:
- At the time a course is deleted.
  - At the time it is put on reserve by a department.
  - Retroactively, when a course was last taught before automatically being put on the reserve list. (i.e. A course number that has not been taught for three years and placed on reserve for an additional three years then deleted, can be used again in two years after the deletion.)  
See Section 5-10.6.16.2.



## **Summary of Findings of the Ad Hoc Faculty Development/Mentoring Envisioning Group**

**April 11, 2003**

The Ad Hoc Faculty Development/Mentoring Envisioning Group includes Professors Robert Carbaugh, Michael Chinn, JoAnn DeLuca, Richard Mack, David Majsterek, and Lisa Weyandt. Charged with the development of a new vision of purpose, institutions and procedures for enhancing faculty development at CWU, the group met over winter term 2003. The group focused upon both mentoring of new faculty and providing development opportunities for all faculty. As for the relationship of the two concepts, mentoring was treated as a subset of faculty development. Key points of their findings are summarized in this brief.

### **New Faculty Mentoring: Definition, Scope, Process and Accountability**

**Definition:** New faculty mentoring at CWU is a required activity which incorporates guidance and clear feedback from colleagues and administrators at a minimum of once per year for purposes of facilitating faculty development towards reappointment, tenure and promotion. The mentoring should be based upon approved and printed performance standards at both the college and departmental levels.

**Standards:** In order to initiate systematic mentoring, a set of targets for faculty performance must be established. The group recommends that standards for tenure, promotion and merit be established at both the college and the departmental levels. College level standards would establish a minimum of expectations; departments are encouraged to set standards that exceed college standards in both rigor and detail. As for the process of setting these standards, we recommend that they be developed first at the college level by a representative group of faculty, based in part upon a survey of comparable institutions. Similarly, departments are encouraged to consult comparable external departments when developing their standards. It is important that both sets of standards be distributed widely, as they become the basis for setting performance targets and are therefore critical to the mentoring process.

**Scope:** Mentoring of all new faculty, both tenure-track and adjunct, should be required. Mentors will be assigned at the departmental level: assigned mentors can be individuals, mentoring committees, or personnel committees. Mentoring should encompass the full range of faculty activities, focusing upon teaching and research/creative expression/performance.

**Procedures:** Mentoring of teaching performance should be based on objective evidence. The group recommends incorporating both arranged classroom observation by peer mentors and feedback from SEOs into the mentoring process. Mentors should review and provide feedback concerning course materials such as syllabi and exams. As for mentoring of research/creative expression/performance, it is critical for the mentors and faculty to develop a three-year scholarship plan that is reviewed and revised annually.

**Accountability:** An annual report by the mentor(s) should accompany each faculty member's annual review, at the time when such portfolios are forwarded up the academic hierarchy. It is recommended that deans receive informal feedback on a quarterly basis from mentors about their mentoring activities and faculty progress.

**Compensation:** Compensation to those faculty who have a significant mentoring loads due to either departmental size or tenure/non-tenure balance can take the form of either release time or faculty development monies. Such compensation will be arranged through the department chair, based upon the policies of the college dean.

### **Proposed Faculty Development Center and Its Potential Scope of Activities**

The group found that there were a number of faculty development functions that either were not possible at the departmental or college level or that were more efficiently provided at the university level. A Faculty Development Center could provide most of these functions, encompassing elements of faculty development for teaching, research/creative expression/performance, and service responsibilities. To minimize costs, it was felt that it was not necessary to provide a physical center, but it was critical that approximately one FTE of resources be dedicated to funding a part-time director and staff. The role of the director and staff is primarily to develop, schedule and search out funding for faculty development activities. It is assumed that the director will initially be a faculty member who is given release time from teaching responsibilities.

**Instructional Mentoring.** The Faculty Development Center should have a comprehensive role in instructional mentoring that complements activities at the departmental level. Its dual foci should be on the mechanics of teaching and the philosophies of the teaching/learning nexus. It is critical that the Center functions to spread best teaching practices across the entire faculty, rather than be viewed as an institution of remediation for those professors who have serious problems with their teaching. Thus the Center will:

- Focus on empirically validated procedures.
- Base development of teaching skills upon a full set of practices.
- Work with new faculty at the earliest opportunity.
- Make teaching development an ongoing process, and not a "one-shot" operation.
- Encourage mentor/mentee pairs to attend workshops together.
- Become the source of instruction in new technologies.

---

**Research Mentoring.** Similarly, The Faculty Development Center should have a comprehensive role in promoting research/creative expression/performance that complements such activities at the departmental level. Its focus should be upon assisting all faculty in developing and maintaining a forward-looking agenda of research/creative expression/performance. This can be accomplished through the offering of

developmental workshops and the funding of opportunities for faculty members to develop research/creative expression/performance activities. Examples of developmental workshop topics include:

- Setting a Research Agenda and Adhering to It
- Strategies for Developing an Agenda for Creative Expression/Performance
- Grants Workshop: Finding External Funds and Crafting Proposals
- The Structure of Journal Articles
- Dealing with Editors: The "Tao" of Getting Published

Similarly, faculty development opportunities that are currently funded above the college level can be centralized at the Faculty Development Center. Examples of existing opportunities include: full-term research leaves, summer research stipends, small grants for research, funding for page charges, faculty professional travel. It is assumed that all of these programs would continue to be highly competitive. One critical role of the Center staff will be to search for external monies to fund additional opportunities.

**Developing Service Roles.** The Center can also play a role in assisting faculty in developing their service roles, particularly in circumstances where there are sufficient economies of group presentation. Examples of this nature of outreach include: workshops on advisement, service learning, and the opportunities and conduct of committee service.

### **Summary Findings**

We have informally surveyed mentoring and faculty development programs and activities on campus and have found that there is a vast gulf between those departments and programs where mentoring and development is well structured and successful and those where there is essentially no active mentoring and where few established standards for development exist. Accordingly, we find that:

- There is need for a structured program of new faculty mentoring, based upon standards that are set at both the college and departmental levels.

- Mentoring should be, as much as possible, based upon objective evidence about the degree to which the standards for Teaching and Research/ Creative Expression/Performance are being met.

- An annual report by the mentor(s) should accompany each faculty member's annual review, and less formal assessment should be provided quarterly to the chair and the dean.

- A Faculty Development Center should be established to take up a comprehensive role in instructional and research development of all faculty. This role complements activities at the departmental level.



The Faculty Development Center will initially require one FTE, comprised of director and staff.

A number of existing development opportunities for faculty can be centralized at the Faculty Development Center.

# ***Evaluation of Instruction Committee***

## ***Brief***

January 30, 2002

Motion No. 02-04 (Passed): The Faculty Senate Executive Committee made a motion that was approved: "Create the Ad Hoc Faculty Evaluation of Instruction Committee charged with determining a comprehensive and systematic process for evaluating instruction. In their deliberations, the committee should at least consider SEOI, peer review, self-review, and administrative assessment."

It is the intent of the Evaluation of Instruction Committee to provide the Faculty Senate Executive Committee with our initial proposal for addressing this charge.

## ***Evaluation of Instruction: A brief background***

Nationwide, some form of evaluation of instruction has been used for tenure, promotion and compensation purposes in higher education for decades. It is assumed that evaluation of instruction contributes to improvements in university-level teaching; however, there is very little evidence to support this assumption. The evidence that does exist is mixed at best and often suggests that the efficacy of an evaluation system relies heavily on the way in which evaluations are carried out and used. Unfortunately there is widespread reliance on student evaluations as the primary (if not sole) source of evaluative information. Only rarely has the feedback provided by students, peers and instructors themselves been used for faculty development and evaluation purposes.

## ***What does work?***

Teaching improvements are most likely when comprehensive faculty evaluation programs are in place. We determined that such programs should include assessments that are:

- designed to be used to improve instructional skills and techniques (i.e. faculty development purposes) as well as for personnel decisions.
- designed to focus on the many different aspects of teaching rather than exclusively on classroom lectures or activities.
- conducted by professional colleagues (both internal and external peer evaluators), academic administrators, and the individual faculty member, in addition to students.

## **Other Substantive Concerns**

***Academic Freedom; Reliability; Validity; Fairness; Promoting instructional development; Institutional Usefulness; Credibility***

## ***The Ideal EOI System***

The ideal system for evaluation of instruction must include:

### ***a) Multiple Aspects of Teaching***

Classroom delivery of the course content, textbook selection, syllabi, course content, examinations, technology use, the incorporation of laboratories, field experience or community service should all be considered as part of the evaluation process.

### ***b) Multiple Criteria***

Instructors should be required to identify course goals and criteria for determining whether these goals are being met. However, it is also possible that in some cases, other measures might also reflect teaching efficacy. For instructors who teach prerequisite courses, the subsequent teacher could assess entry-level skills that are required for their course. The following represents an incomplete summary of some of the kinds of criteria that could be used:

- Classroom observations (by colleagues, peers trained in pedagogical development, academic administrators)
- Content analysis of course materials including syllabi, handouts, exams, and readings, textbook and readings, film, class activities, homework, etc...
- Evaluation of student achievement in specific courses in which content or skill is expected to carryover to another course.
- Assessment of student performance on national tests (i.e. exit exams).

### ***c) Multiple Methods of Data Collection***

Currently, the most common method of peer or administrative assessment at CWU is the classroom visit, usually followed by a brief meeting and a letter. However, a variety of methods can be used. Rating scales written *a priori* by departmental committees, formalized departmental peer-group meetings or interviews, videotapes, content analysis of syllabi, handouts and exams, etc., can all be part of the peer or administrative assessment interaction.

### ***d) Multiple Sources***

Instructional assessment is more likely to be reliable and valid if multiple sources of assessment are used. Self, students, internal and external professional colleagues, academic administrators and/or department chairs are all needed to ensure that the assessment is fair, reliable and valid.

## ***Rewards for good teaching***

It is important that the guidelines agreed upon by the Faculty Senate and the CWU Administration be supported by real contingencies. Consequences for participating in the evaluation process (or not) should be clearly stated and enforced. It is the committee's recommendation that specific support materials be submitted during each annual Performance Review process that accurately reflect an instructor's instructional development and evaluative participation and progress.

## ***Draft Recommendation***

All instructional faculty must participate in a four-component instructional evaluation process. These four components include:

### ***I. Student Evaluation of Instruction***

All instructors must have every course evaluated by their students at least once a year. A revised SEOI (as put forth by the SEOI subcommittee) will be used when finalized. Additional work is needed to develop alternate forms of SEOI forms for non-lecture based courses (i.e. laboratory, seminars, performance-based courses).

- a) SEOI forms will be distributed among students in the absence of the instructor.
- b) After the students complete the SEOI form, they are to be delivered to the departmental secretary who will send them to the University Testing Center to be scanned and summarized.
- c) Due to their sensitive nature, SEOI forms will be scanned and summarized by non-student personnel ...

### ***II. Peer Review***

All instructors must participate in at least one type of peer-based assessment or review interaction during the course of the academic year. Peer-based assessments or review interactions might include:

- a) Classroom visits by an instructional peer with teaching feedback
- b) Syllabus/materials review and revision with (internal or external) peer feedback.
- c) Departmental faculty development (Dead day) activities focused on peer review or interaction ...

### ***III. Administrative Assessment***

Administrative assessment will consist of a single classroom visit, a face-to-face meeting and written feedback from a CWU administrator of the instructor's choice.

### ***IV. Self-Review***

The EOI committee recommends that the self-review of instruction be the defining component of the CWU evaluation of instruction process. The primary goal of the present recommendation is to get teaching faculty to engage in instructional development activities with students, peers and administrators. Then the instructor should reflect on the feedback given from all three sources and identify areas of strength and areas of needed growth or change.

**We request a 2-year extension for the committee in order to:**

1. Complete the development of SEOI forms for various types of instruction – classroom instruction, labs, performance courses, PE courses, seminars, etc...
2. Develop classroom (lab, seminar, etc.) evaluation forms for peers and administrators who might be evaluating classroom instruction.
3. Develop a weighting system that will produce a single numerical score for faculty that reflects both SEOIs and all other aspects of instruction including increased involvement in faculty develop of instruction activities. This would be the primary measure of instructional performance used by the administration for reappointment, tenure, promotion and merit.
4. Determine how much information from SEOIs (and possibly from the instructor) should be made public for student use. Possibly add questions that would provide information of interest to students. Then develop a system for disseminating that information (on the web, book, etc).
5. Look at the decoding/scanning of SEOIs to determine how we can keep that process reliable and accurate.
6. Develop a cover page for Evaluation of Instruction to be used for all performance review requests related to reappointment, tenure, promotion or merit. This page would accompany all required documentation for EOI (SEOI summary sheets, letters from peers and administrators), and would include the calculations of the final Teaching Performance Score (TPS).
7. Meet with the Personnel Committee to finalize the proposal.